

REMARKS

No claims are amended. No new claims are added. Claims 1-45 are pending for consideration. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that this application be allowed and forwarded on to issuance.

The § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pub No. 2003/0158897 A1 to Ben-Natan et al., (hereinafter "Ben-Natan") in view of US Pub No. 2001/0056429 A1 to Moore et al. (hereinafter "Moore").

Claims 10-31, 33-35 and 37-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-Natan in view of Moore and U.S Patent No. 6,668,369 to Krebs et al. (hereinafter "Krebs").

Claims 32 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-Natan in view of Moore, Krebs and US Pub No. 2002/0026461A1 to Kutay et al. (hereinafter "Kutay").

Examiner Interview

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the time spent on the phone discussing this application and, in particular, the Ben-Natan reference.

During that discussion, Applicant again pointed out to the Examiner that the content on which the Office relies in making out the rejection of Applicant's claims is not entitled to the earlier filing date of Ben-Natan's provisional application. The Examiner agreed that Ben-Natan was indeed a continuation-in-part of its earlier-filed provisional application. The Examiner agreed to go back

1 and evaluate Ben-Natan but would do so in response to a paper being filed in the
2 Office.

3 In addition, Applicant and Examiner discussed some of the claims which
4 clearly contain subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in Ben-Natan.
5 The Examiner agreed to go back and take a more thorough look at these claims.

6 Applicant is filing this response in a good faith effort to advance
7 prosecution.

8
9 **Claims 1-9**

10 **Claim 1** recites a method of providing a user interface (UI) comprising:

- 11
 - rendering a DHTML document from an XML document using at
12 least one XSLT transformation (XSL-T); and
 - presenting a user interface based, at least in part, on the XSL-T that
13 was used to render the DHTML document.

14 In making out the rejection of claim 1, the Office argues that Ben-Natan
15 teaches all of the subject matter of this claim (citing to page 1, paragraph [0022])
16 except for “using at least one XSLT transformation and presenting a user interface
17 based, at least in part, on the XSL-T that was used to render the DHTML
18 document”. The Office argues notes that Ben-Natan indicates that “the first form
19 may be an instance of the extensible markup language (XML) and the second form
20 in HTML or any extension of it such as DHTML or XHTML”.

21 The Office then relies on Moore and argues that it teaches this subject
22 matter, citing to page 18, paragraph [0291] for support. Based on this, the Office
23 argues that the claimed subject matter would be obvious and, as motivation to
24 combine the references, the Office argues that such would “enable the user, at an
25 indefinite point in time in the future, to manipulate data/document infrastructure
independently and not limit to any state or quality of being independent of a

1 particular storage or computing platform or implementation or at most to only a
2 generic class of storage or computing platforms or implementations". See, Office
3 Action page 4.

4 Applicant would like to point out to the Office two pieces of data that
5 support its argument that Ben-Natan is a *continuation-in-part* of U.S. Provisional
6 Application No. 60/203,081. First, on the front cover sheet of Ben-Natan, item
7 (60) indicates that Ben-Natan is indeed related to the above-mentioned provisional
8 application. However, reference to Ben-Natan's paragraph [0001] indicates that
9 the application that eventually resulted in Ben-Natan "*is a continuation-in-part of*
10 *U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/203,081*". Hence, Ben-Natan is
11 indeed a continuation-in-part application. That is, while Ben-Natan's regular
12 patent application was filed on November 30, 2000 (after the June 21, 2000 filing
13 date of the present application), its corresponding provisional application was filed
14 on May 9, 2000, a little more than a month before the present application. By
15 virtue of Ben-Natan's regular application being a continuation-in-part, the Office
16 will surely appreciate that some subject matter of Ben-Natan (i.e. that which was
17 originally present in its provisional application) is to be accorded the effective date
18 of May 9, 2000; and, other subject matter (that which was added to make the
19 regular patent application a continuation-in-part) is to be accorded a different
20 effective date—that of the filing date of the regular patent application, in this case
21 November 30, 2000.

22 A careful comparison of the excerpt of Ben-Natan's regular application
23 cited by the Office (i.e. page 1, paragraph [0022]) and the originally filed
24 provisional application indicates that the material appearing in the excerpt of the
25 Office does not appear in the provisional application. Specifically, Applicant can
find no discussion in the provisional application that describes the subject matter

1 cited by the Office including the notion that the “first form may be an instance of
2 the extensible markup language (XML) and the second form in HTML or any
3 extension of it such as DHTML or XHTML”. In fact, nowhere in the provisional
4 application can Applicant find the acronyms “DHTML” or “XHTML”.

5 As such, it appears that this subject matter was added to the originally-filed
6 provisional application. This being the case, this subject matter should be
7 accorded an effective date of November 30, 2000. Because this effective date is
8 *after* Applicant’s filing date, this material does not constitute prior art.

9 Responsive to Applicant’s arguments above, the Office refers Applicant to
10 pages 14-24 and to Figs. 15, 17, 19, 22 and 23 of the Ben-Natan’s provisional
11 application.

12 Applicant respectfully submits that this material does not disclose or
13 suggest the subject matter of this claim. Specifically, the material in Ben-Natan’s
14 provisional starting on page 14 through about page 20 can best be summarized as
15 describing a process for representing data in an XML document, using an XSL to
16 extract certain information from the XML document, and then using the extracted
17 information to build a SQL query to query a database. See, e.g., page 18, ¶ 4. The
18 remaining material in Ben-Natan’s provisional (i.e. that beginning on page 20
19 under the heading of “5.4 Registration Forms”) can best be summarized as
20 describing a process of converting data entered in an HTML form into an XML
21 representation. See, e.g., page 24.

22 Applicant cannot find the material upon which the Office relies in making
23 out the rejection of this claim anywhere in Ben-Natan’s provisional.

24 As such, the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness
25 and this claim is allowable. To this extent, the Office’s reliance on Moore is not
seen to add anything of significance.

1 **Claims 2-9** depend from claim 1 and, as such, are allowable as depending
2 from an allowable base claim.

3
4 **Claims 10-19**

5 **Claim 10** recites a method of providing a user interface comprising:

- 6 • considering multiple parameters one of which includes an XSL-T
7 file; and
8 • based upon the considered parameters, rendering a user interface
9 sufficient to enable a user to interact with a DHTML view that has
10 been rendered by the XSL-T file from an XML document.

11 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that this claim
12 “incorporate[s] substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 1...and is
13 similarly rejected along the same rationale”.

14 Applicant submits that the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of
15 obviousness for at least two different reasons. First, if the Office is using the same
16 rationale as used in claim 1 as such pertains to Ben-Natan, then the subject matter
17 on which the Office relies does not appear to have an effective date that renders it
18 prior art. Second, and equally important, the subject matter of claim 10 is not
19 “substantially similar subject matter” as recited in claim 1. For the Office’s
20 convenience, both of these claims are reproduced in the table below:

Claim 1	Claim 10
A method of providing a user interface (UI) comprising: rendering a DHTML document from an XML document using at least one XSLT transformation (XSL-T); and presenting a user interface based, at least in part, on the XSL-T that was used to render the DHTML document.	A method of providing a user interface comprising: considering multiple parameters one of which includes an XSL-T file; and based upon the considered parameters, rendering a user interface sufficient to enable a user to interact with a DHTML view that has been rendered by the XSL-T file from an XML document.

1 Applicant respectfully submits that, even a cursory review of the language
2 of each claim indicates that the subject matter is not substantially similar.

3 Accordingly, for at least these two reasons, the Office has not established a
4 *prima facie* case of obviousness. Given the Office's failure to establish a *prima*
5 *facie* case of obviousness, the Office's reliance on Krebs is not seen to add
6 anything of significance.

7 Claims 11-19 depend from claim 10 and, as such, are allowable as
8 depending from an allowable base claim.

9
10 **Claims 20-26**

11 Claim 20 recites a method of providing a user interface comprising:

- 12 • making a selection in a DHTML view;
- 13 • determining, based upon the selection, a corresponding selection in
14 an XML document;
- 15 • determining, based upon the corresponding selection in the XML
16 document, a corresponding portion of an XML schema;
- 17 • determining, based upon the XML schema portion, one or more
18 types of action that can be undertaken;
- 19 • producing one or more operations that can be undertaken for various
20 determined action types; and
- 21 • determining, from an XSL-T file that rendered the DHTML view, a
22 user interface type that can be displayed for a user and used to
23 implement the one or more operations.

24 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that it
25 incorporates "substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 10-15 above,
and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

Applicant submits that the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of
obviousness for at least two different reasons. First, if the Office is using the same
rationale as used in claim 10 as such pertains to Ben-Natan, then the subject matter
on which the Office relies does not appear to have an effective date that renders it

prior art. Second, and equally important, the subject matter of claim 20 is not "substantially similar subject matter" as recited in claims 10-15. For the Office's convenience, both of these claims are reproduced in the table below:

Claim 10-15	Claim 20
<p>10. A method of providing a user interface comprising: considering multiple parameters one of which includes an XSL-T file; and based upon the considered parameters, rendering a user interface sufficient to enable a user to interact with a DHTML view that has been rendered by the XSL-T file from an XML document.</p> <p>11. The method of claim 10, wherein one parameter comprises a user location within a particular document.</p> <p>12. The method of claim 10, wherein one parameter comprises a portion of an XML schema that corresponds to a user's selection.</p> <p>13. The method of claim 10, wherein one parameter comprises one or more UI types that would be desirable to generate.</p> <p>14. The method of claim 10, wherein the parameters comprise: a user location within a particular document; a portion of an XML schema that corresponds to a user's selection; and one or more UI types that would be desirable to generate.</p> <p>15. The method of claim 10, wherein the considering of the multiple parameters comprises considering one or more constructs within an XSL-T file.</p>	<p>20. A method of providing a user interface comprising: making a selection in a DHTML view; determining, based upon the selection, a corresponding selection in an XML document; determining, based upon the corresponding selection in the XML document, a corresponding portion of an XML schema; determining, based upon the XML schema portion, one or more types of action that can be undertaken; producing one or more operations that can be undertaken for various determined action types; and determining, from an XSL-T file that rendered the DHTML view, a user interface type that can be displayed for a user and used to implement the one or more operations.</p>

Applicant respectfully submits that even a cursory review of the language of each claim indicates that the subject matter is not substantially similar.

Accordingly, for at least these two reasons, the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Given the Office's failure to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Office's reliance on Krebs is not seen to add anything of significance.

Claims 21-26 depend from claim 20 and, as such, are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

Claims 27-34

Claim 27 recites a method of manipulating an XML document comprising:

- defining one or more crystals, each of which containing one or more behaviors and an XSLT transformation for transforming an XML document into a DHTML view;
- using the one or more crystals to render a DHTML view from an XML document;
- enabling user interaction with the DHTML view; and
- mapping, via the one or more behaviors, user interactions in the DHTML view to the XML document.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that it incorporates “substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 10 and 39 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

Applicant submits that the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness for at least two different reasons. First, if the Office is using the same rationale as used in claim 10 as such pertains to Ben-Natan, then the subject matter on which the Office relies does not appear to have an effective date that renders it prior art. Second, and equally important, the subject matter of claim 27 is not “substantially similar subject matter” as recited in claims 10 and 39. For the Office’s convenience, these claims are reproduced in the table below:

Claim 27	Claims 10 and 39
<p>27. A method of manipulating an XML document comprising:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> defining one or more crystals, each of which containing one or more behaviors and an XSLT transformation for transforming an XML document into a DHTML view; using the one or more crystals to render a DHTML view from an XML document; enabling user interaction with the DHTML view; and mapping, via the one or more behaviors, user interactions in the DHTML view to the XML document. 	<p>10. A method of providing a user interface comprising:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> considering multiple parameters one of which includes an XSL-T file; and based upon the considered parameters, rendering a user interface sufficient to enable a user to interact with a DHTML view that has been rendered by the XSL-T file from an XML document. <p>39. A method of manipulating an XML document comprising:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> associating one or more behaviors with a DHTML tag in a DHTML view that has been rendered from an XML document; and responsive to a user interacting with a DHTML view associated with the DHTML tag, using the one or more behaviors to map user interactions to the XML document and effect structural changes on the XML document.

Applicant respectfully submits that even a cursory review of the language of each claim indicates that the subject matter is not substantially similar.

Accordingly, for at least these two reasons, the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Given the Office's failure to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Office's reliance on Krebs is not seen to add anything of significance.

Claims 28-34 depend from claim 27 and, as such, are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. In addition, given the Office's failure to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the rejection of claim 32 over Kutay is not seen to add anything of significance.

Claims 35-38

Claim 35 recites one or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to:

- provide multiple crystals, each of which containing one or more behaviors and an XSLT transformation for transforming an XML document into a DHTML view;
- use one or more of the crystals to render a DHTML view from an XML document;
- attach at least one behavior to at least one DHTML tag;
- ascertain that a user has interacted with a DHTML view associated with the at least one DHTML tag; and
- use the behavior associated with the at least one DHTML tag to map a user interaction back to the XML document and make associated structural changes in the XML document.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that "claim 35 is directed to a computer-readable media for performing the method of claims 10, 20,

1 27 and 39 and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.” Applicant
2 respectfully points out that claim 35 is an independent claim that merits an
3 independent examination. Nevertheless, for the reasons mentioned above, the
4 Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness and, for at least
5 those reasons, this claim is allowable.

6 Claims 36-38 depend from claim 35 and, as such, are allowable as
7 depending from an allowable base claim. In addition, given the Office’s failure to
8 establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the rejection of claim 36 over Kutay is
9 not seen to add anything of significance.

10 11 Claims 39-45

12 Claim 39 recites a method of manipulating an XML document comprising:

- 13
- 14 • associating one or more behaviors with a DHTML tag in a DHTML
view that has been rendered from an XML document; and
 - 15 • responsive to a user interacting with a DHTML view associated with
the DHTML tag, using the one or more behaviors to map user
16 interactions to the XML document and effect structural changes on
the XML document.
- 17

18 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Ben-Natan
19 teaches using one or more behaviors to map user interactions to the XML
20 document and effect structural changes on the XML document”, citing to page 1,
21 paragraph [0022]. As noted above, the subject matter cited to by the Office
22 appears to be missing from Ben-Natan’s provisional application. Hence, its
23 effective date is after the present application was filed. Accordingly, the material
24 cited to by the Office does not appear to constitute prior art. As such, the Office
25 has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness and this claim is allowable.

1 To this extent, the Office's reliance on Moore and Krebs is not seen to add
2 anything of significance.

3 Claims 40-44 depend from claim 39 and, as such, are allowable as
4 depending from an allowable base claim.

5 Claim 45 recites a software structure embodied on a computer-readable
6 medium comprising one or more crystals, each of which containing at least one
7 behavior and XSL-T for rendering XML into DHTML, the behaviors being data
8 shape dependent and being configured for use with common data shapes
9 independent of any XML schema.

10 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that "claim 45 is
11 directed to a computer-readable media for performing the method of claims 1, 40
12 and 42 and is similarly rejected under the same rationale." Applicant respectfully
13 points out that claim 45 is an independent claim that merits an independent
14 examination. Nevertheless, for the reasons mentioned above, the Office has failed
15 to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness and, for at least those reasons, this
16 claim is allowable.

Conclusion

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11/4/05

By: 

Lance R. Sadler
Reg. No. 38,605
(509) 324-9256